[redacted]

Must Remain in
Transcription Room

M 2336

Santa Rosa

December 11, 1973

MR. NYLAND: Are the tapes running already? Huh Ron? Sorry we are a little late but it couldn't be helped. I'm glad to see all of you.

It surely is not the regular Santa Rosa group is it Al? Huh? Why all this interest? Of course we have to talk about Gurdjieff; I hope that's your interest. But, but why do we really want to talk about him? I would like to make as much as we can, these few meetings that I will be here, question and answer. But it makes it very difficult when there are several new people, so then I'm a little bit compelled to say something particularly in the beginning, about what we mean by Work or what is the place that the ideas of Gurdjieff occupy in one's, ~~an~~, daily life. So that's why I ask, why are we interested in these ideas, and then of course I ask immediately, do you know anything about the ideas? Because there is a great deal that goes on at the present time, partly as esoteric knowledge and partly a little flattering ideas that have to do with something that perhaps is spiritual and also, unfortunately, certain things that are said in the name of Gurdjieff. It cannot be helped, I think, because

after all there are many little publications about it and many interpretations and it becomes quite difficult, really, to sift them out and to stick close to what, what Gurdjieff meant.

There is only one source which is All And Everything, and of course Remarkable Men, and the Third Series which perhaps will be published, nobody knows for sure as yet, but that's source material. Everything else is secondary, partly interpretation, partly a little addition; and it cannot be helped because each person receives ideas like these from Gurdjieff, translates them many times into his own, into his own background where he has lived and tries to place them in a certain way so that they can understand them and it's a little difficult sometimes he doesn't want to bother about them, sometimes he is satisfied with just an interpretation which satisfies him only for that one moment and he never finds out if it's right or not because usually many people who read about Gurdjieff or happen to hear about it don't take the next step which is required; that is, an application of the ideas. The reason why they should be applied is that's the only way you can find out, by verification for yourself if what Gurdjieff is talking about is right or not. So, when it's ...when you stay with an interpretation you don't get very far unless there is a very definite description of what is meant by Work. And that's why I say, why are we interested in it because what do we expect from Work? You can say more insight, more understanding of oneself, more reason why one ought to Work, and what then is an aim.

Let me say it very simply. The aim of the ideas and the application is to grow up; that is, to develop what is in each man potential. The potentiality exists in any unconscious being. When there is the question of unconsciousness that naturally one believes also in the possibility of the existence of Consciousness. And

we must say in the very beginning that Consciousness is not available on this earth unless you work for it, or unless it happens to be accidentally experienced.

What is the potentiality of a man? We say, simply say that he has a start with his feeling, but it's not sufficiently developed to become really emotional and he has a little bit of a start with his intellect; enough, just enough you might say to make a living on earth. As far as Consciousness is concerned, an intellect is not much developed. His physical body of course is in existence and that is sufficient up to the Si of the tonal scale, when Si - DO is the last note. So, what has to grow up? If you are familiar with scales, that what has to grow up for what we call Kesdjanian body, it's the SOL - LA - Si; that what has to grow up for an intellectual body or a Soul is the whole scale from DO on up, except that DO functions a little bit in an unconscious realm. Why should it develop? Why are we interested in that possibility of development? Why don't we say that simply by increasing the total knowledge of oneself one can gain the same result?

The result, as Gurdjieff explains it, is to become more Objective; that is, if this world of ours in which we live is subjective; it is necessary to become Objective. That is, we should lose our subjectivity, or, if we don't lose it at least change it into an Objective something. Sometimes we say a person has to change from personality to become an Individuality. Or, we say he has to develop so that his Kesdjanian body becomes complete. That is, the DO - RE - MI is feeling and the SOL - LA - Si is emotion, deeper emotion. I'll explain the difference in a minute. And it is necessary to develop a Soul because it only exists in embryo. And the

Do - Re - Mi, Fa, Sol - La - Si of that scale does not exist unless one Works for it. The reason why we talk about Objectivity is mostly because that happens when one dies. Then when one loses one's body, also a little bit of the feeling, and there is something that remains in existence as Life, sometimes in a little bit of a form -- we don't know very much about it -- but not a form as material as our physical body. And that we have to face death, all of us, is an indication, if you want to believe that, when life exists and when one believes that life is eternal, that then of course there must be some reason why we have to die to the form of the physical body. And if we leave out reincarnation and so forth and recurrence for a little while, it is of course logical to assume that life always has existed and still exists after one dies. How much it exists with one's name, it is not so easy to, to decide, but we'll assume that it will continue for a little while as a spirit. And with that kind of an assumption which can be proved more or less, one can also say that one has existed before and we know also enough about such kind of indications that you may have had a previous life somewhere; whatever that may mean, such things are of interest but they are of no particular practical value.

The practical value of Objectivity is to create a new kind of a world - a world we call Objective. And the difference between subjectivity and Objectivity is that for our definition, Objectivity is only the negation of subjectivity; that what it is <u>not</u> is Objective. What exactly it is, I don't think we know very much until we have an experience of Objectivity. And the question of Work is simply, how can one become Objective? - At the same time fullfill the function or the responsibility of a man on earth. And the question is; does he have a responsibility? You can quibble about that but it seems logical assumed that there must be a reason

why he happens to be on earth, and why on earth? Because that's where we are even if we don't like it. If we could get away from this earth maybe you would like to do that, because sometimes it's very difficult to live and maybe we don't always understand and we have no answers to question so why should we want to continue to live.

There is inherent in each person a desire, I think, to protect his life, and that he will assume that that life stops as far as Mother Nature is willing to go and then it's up to a person himself to see in what respect can he continue, Gurdjieff calls that "in accordance with the laws of Great Nature". And it makes very definitely a distinction between subjectivity as a result of Mother Nature on the Earth existing and that what belongs really in our total cosmic scale to the planets, the planetary level and to the Sun as far as we go with our solar system as far as we know a little bit about such things.

So, in general this kind of Work has to do with the development of a man, an evolution as Ouspenski would call it, which is right, but what presupposes also involution and the idea is that one has between the two -- involution and evolution -- an equilibrium, and that for man it is necessary to find out how to achieve that state of equilibrium because that will give him to some extent a rest, or peace. If he doesn't have that he is a little chaotic within and he has to try and find it. If he has found it, it does not mean it's quiet, it has to be in constant motion. One has to find where is this, that what takes place beyond such activity.

Why do we want to talk about these things? Because it's a serious question. It's a question that each person will have to face sometime, it doesn't matter when. It does matter for him, but it doesn't matter if he doesn't find it in this life; he will find

it some other time. There is a law in nature meaning that that what exists now will not always exist in this way, and that the opportunities are given for a man for development, and that it is his task to find out how to develop, and that the full development of that might end in a certain concept of absoluteness - whatever is meant by that we don't know. We, we like to talk about it, we like to talk about omniscience and omnipotence and omnipresence and so forth. It has very little meaning unless one starts to grow up more or less in connection with that so you know what you're talking about. We remain very often too complicated instead of becoming much more simple for oneself, which is necessary for a true development of a man. In the first place he has to find out what he is because he doesn't know it. If he feels or he thinks about himself, it is usually interpretative and thinking about it means associated values which have no particular value because they draw away from that which is the present. The difficulty for a man is to understand the concept of a moment. But it is much more difficult to become impartial to oneself, and that exactly is what is necessary, otherwise one doesn't die in the right way; that is, the freedom that is necessary for a person to achieve, if he can do that on earth, is really that he understands what is meant by complete selflessness, that he exists and can accept himself that he is, mostly beginning by simply saying that he is alive, and afterwards trying to find out what are the manifestations of his life, and after that, when he can continue to remain Objective about himself, what is needed for man to change in order to make that what is his appearance in the form in which his life is given, that that belongs to life itself in the form it should be. With other words, how can a man become Becoming: that what he does is becoming to him? We say in general of course that a man has to become Conscious and Conscientious, and Gurdjieff

would say become Harmonious. It simply means that he has to reach a certain sense of equilibrium within himself in which the different parts of himself are adjusted to each other, and that the totality is made that we call the level of his being.

Well, in general I would say that is all I want to say about, so far, about Work. I have a habit of talking too much and I don't want to do that tonight. There is a group here; I prefer questions from the group if we possibly can. Anyone who is interested in Gurdjieff perhaps has, has questions, and maybe that would be better if we have some questions now if you want to ask them.

Question: Gurdjieff was a very simple man?

MR. NYLAND: Gurdjieff? Was he a simple man?

Question: Yea.

MR. NYLAND: Oh, No!

Question: I was wondering, ah, you talked about, about being too complex.

MR. NYLAND: Oh, you mean if he could act as a simple man.

Question: Yeh. Well, no. I mean, I realize that he was very complex from reading some of his works. And, ah...

MR. NYLAND: What do you mean by simple?

Question: Well, what you were, you, you mentioned about becoming more, ah, simple...

MR. NYLAND: That's right. First that one has to become simple. After that you can become complicated. Where Gurdjieff was, I really wouldn't know. I think a man who actually, by definition, is able to do that what has to be done under any condition, and understands such conditions that he then can do whatever is required by the conditions, I think it becomes a little more complicated than just being simple. But, let's say he is simple. What does it mean for you?

Question: I wasn't, ah, realizing, ah, that, ah, being simple, and,

doesn't, being simple doesn't mean not being complicated.

MR. NYLAND: I think the simplicity we talk about is really a sense of an equilibrium. You know what I mean. The more peaceful the more simple the person can be. What I mean, what questions do you have, maybe you have read, maybe you have understood everything.

Question: I have a question.

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Question: Could you speak of self observation? Could you explain what you mean by self observation?

MR. NYLAND: We use the word Awareness many times in order to distinguish it from thought. In order to find out what Awareness means we use the word Observation which is more or less familiar to us, although Awareness we also know something about, but it is not used in the sense that we usually have the use of in ordinary language. Self Observation of course means an Observation process of oneself. It depends what you want to define as self. Self with a small 's' is that what I am as a personality. Self with a capital 'S' is that what is essentially essence of myself. The assumption is -- and I think it's quite logical -- that a man really exists in different ways or has different forms of life being expressed. If we say in general he has a physical body and he has an emotional body and the potentiality of a soul body or an intellectual one, those are simply the three centers -- Bobbinkandelnost as Gurdjieff calls them -- which have been developed up to a certain point and have been more-or-less in equilibrium as far as man is concerned when he is living on this earth. Observation process means that there is a creation of an "I" which Observes. The creation of an "I" as "I" means an Objective faculty which starts to function by gathering facts about oneself. In order to make the facts truthful, such facts have to be recorded at the time when they do happen because we want to exclude associations. They have to be also accept-

able in the sense that I do not wish to like or dislike them; that is in order to eliminate my feeling. So then the process of Self Observation means an "I" is functioning for the purpose of collecting knowledge about oneself. It is an extension, you might say, of self knowledge. But the question now of this self first is that what I am on earth as a man walking around. What it might become afterwards is the knowledge of that what is the reality for himself if he could be Aware of that what he actually is.

For simplicity sake, you can say that a man has two possibilities: one is his ordinary life which he is familiar with, the other is what I said in the beginning, it's the creation of a new world which is based on the development of spiritual values. Sometimes we say it is essential, sometimes we even go further than that and believe that it is essential essentiality. That we call Magnetic Center in a man.

The "I" is simply an indication of an Objective faculty, of that what could function after it has been created by a man when he has that wish. So that the creation of "I" always is preceded by a wish for growth, or a wish for development or a wish for understanding. When "I" exists, even if in the beginning it exists in imagination, it becomes real as soon as it starts to function. When an "I" receives, by means of Observing my physical body for instance, the fact of the existence of my body, such facts have a reality in this life and make, then, "I", when it receives such facts, also real. From that time on this "I" is real. Although it may be small it starts to function and the more it continues to function as a result of my wish for this "I" to function the more information I will get about my self when the three necessities are fulfilled; that is, if the Observation is pure, if there is Impartiality, and if there is Simultaneity, then I can be sure that the facts I receive are absolute. That is, there is no further question of interpretation, there's no further question about liking or disliking,

there is just a fact in existence; that what is, is. You understand it?

Questioner: Yes ~~Sir.~~ thank you End #

MR. NYLAND: O. K. I didn't come here to give a lecture you know. I came here and I come here on the west coast for certain groups which are here. That a group sometimes may have many new members does not concern me very much unless there is an interest. If there is an interest you can talk. If there isn't, then you have to listen to the questions of other people who are interested to ask questions.

Question: Mr. Nyland?

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Questioner: What is the realtionship between the notes of the scale?

MR. NYLAND: About what?

Question: What is the relationships between the notes of the scale and the development of man?

MR. NYLAND: We simply indicate the development of a man by a scale, in accordance with ordinary musical scale, so that the DO is the note where it is struck, as it there, is a form of life. That a man in the development of his ordinary life goes through a DO - RE - MI stage in which then he reaches the FA bridge which cannot be easily over - bridged unless there is some very definite influence from the out - side, and the continuation of the SOL - LA - SI is a further develop - ment of what takes place in a man, and the SI, when that is overbridged is his death. Is that what you mean?

Question: Uh - huh.

MR. NYLAND: The tonal scale can be applied to practically every process we are familiar with. All you have to do is to give it different names.

Iva Blank: Ah, Mr. Nyland.

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Iva Blank: Last time you were here I, ah, in October, I asked you a question about the despair of feeling, of um, feeling that the infinitude of spaces within oneself could never be filled, and you, you replied

that the emptiness was there because instead of experiencing the life, I experienced the field of forces of cohesion of form and I have thought about that field and I can't, uh, I can't think what it is, or why it diverts me from life itself.

MR. NYLAND: Do you see the differences between a form and life itself?

Iva Blank: I can think about it but I can't seem to think it.

MR. NYLAND: No, it's not so much the thinking. Can you experience it?

Iva Blank: I have experienced it, once.

MR. NYLAND: It's almost by intuition, you know, that one experiences it. It is something that does take place even without your knowledge. At the same time it is an experience one has and you say it is true.

Iva Blank: Yes.

MR. NYLAND: If you know it once you hope, of course, that you will have it again. The fact that you have it once means that there is a possibility of having it. So that's fortunate. I think the more one trys to understand the meaning of life itself without a form, the closer one will come to the possibility of filling that what is an empty space within oneself, but it has to be based on an experience of oneself in which life is expressed and then trying to see what this life is without the form in which it is expressed.

Iva Blank: Um, I can't quite understand why....

MR. NYLAND: I know it's difficult.

Iva Blank: Pardon?

MR. NYLAND: It is difficult.

Iva Blank: So diverted by the form. Why does this, uh, force of this cohesion attract me so much?

MR. NYLAND: Life --- I don't know why it attracts you particulary be - cause I think the question of life is much more attractive than the form. Although we live constantly by the form and we assume that the form is life. But if you try to, try to think about any kind of spirituality,

any kind of a spirit, any kind of a concept of God, you don't have to immediately put it in a form. And I think there are for us as a human being sometimes experiences we are not so dependent on form; that is, emotionally there are many experiences that one says I don't really want to put it into a form. If you are hunting for words and you cannot find them and finally end up with a sigh, it is not a form in which you would wish it, at the same time it does exist with something that is very definitely an experience of yourself. Try to look at space when you look at the constellations and try to imagine what is in space itself. Many times such kind of concentration, if you can maintain it, is very useful to find within yourself a certain answer that you haven't had before. The final solution is really to continue to Work; that is, whatever one does and see if that what is being done is done in a certain form which, under this Observation process, becomes more and more transparent and will give you finally a concept of life existing within the form. Think about death, what happens when death takes place if you believe in the continued existence of life. Alright? Think about it because these things are not thought out.

Iva Blank: Well, I can't think now, being, I can think about it but I can't think it ---

MR. NYLAND: You can think it.

Iva Blank: But I'm not diverted from it. I'm not appalled by it.

MR. NYLAND: No, that's right. You have to start with a feeling about it. The difficulty with that is, for us, that the feeling is connected with the form.

Iva Blank: Yes.

MR. NYLAND: So the solution would be, how can we separate that what

is a feeling center from the expression by means of the physical body. The only way to understand that and the way to really come to a conclusion is by means of Work, because only with Work on oneself will you make a distinction between the form since you can accept it as is and have no desire to change it, then there is a possibility, as I say, for that form to become transparent. If there is nothing anymore to be described about the form, then I am free from it, and still I admit to myself that something is alive.

Take concepts like love or anger. They need not always be expressed in a form.

Iva Blank: In a movement?

MR. NYLAND: In a form. Still one can feel them. Particularly when you extend feeling in the direction of an emotional quality. By that I mean that when a feeling is expressed and it concerns me, I can say that I am selfish and self centered or I consider myself as existing, but when I include in this concept of feeling different forms of life also existing -- sometimes for which I care, sometimes which I respect or admire or sometimes revere, so there is a reverence about having that as something beautiful, and holy -- then I introduce more and more the concept of life as appearing in different kinds of forms. And when I can continue to care and deepen my emotional state I could include even God. And at that moment when that happens, I disappear; that is, I myself. And that all that exists is the existence of God Himself. Many times it's a question of losing oneself in order to find life.

Iva Blank: Thank you.

MR. NYLAND: I hope it means something.

Iva Blank: Oh well it's the other way around you know -- another way.

MR. NYLAND: It is not so easy. It is not easy.

Iva Blank: I didn't hear.

MR. NYLAND: It is not easy.

M 2336

Terry: Mr. Nyland?

MR. NYLAND: Yeh.

Terry: What is the relation~~tions~~ship between, between the gathering of data, the facts, the absolute facts and the growth of "I"?

MR. NYLAND: The relation is that "I" is the instrument by which such data have been received. "I" will continue to grow the more, you might say, it Works. The Working of "I" means it is engaged in an Observation process. If "I" in the beginning is very small because my wish does not know exactly how to create something that can function Objectively, I can assume by the continued exercise which I gave "I" or ask "I" to perform for me, that the "I" will gradually develop. And so, the more data I can obtain myself of that kind that we talk about -- that is, Objective facts or facts of an absolute value or facts which are truthful in the real sense of the word --the more such facts have been accumulated by "I", the more "I" has grown up, even to the point of maturity. And simply I use the word maturity in order to give an idea about growth. In reality an "I" is not like a body which grows up to maturity like we are familiar with in the physical form. But when it becomes really cognizant of its own existence and the ability to be able to do, which usually goes together with growth and it takes place many times either in the feeling or in the mind, then this "I" has a quality which I call 'maturity' simply because it then can function different from what it used to be when it was so-called 'young'. So there is a direct relationship: the more facts and data I have, the more I can assume that "I" is more fullgrown. Does that answer it?

Terry: Yes, that makes more sense to me that what - it isn't the gathering of the facts itself but the development of "I" that is the goal.

MR. NYLAND: It is the development the facts which are essential, of value. The "I" itself existing does not mean very much more then just the "I" becomes an instrument. The "I" is only the mediator. It has a very definite task to fulfill. The "I" in the last instance really means

that God sends some kind of form of life into this "I", which, then, this "I" has to fulfill as a task for me. So the "I" becomes only an instrument, even if it's full - grown, it still remains an instrument. That what counts is the truth about myself, what I am as an ordinary human being, and the utilization of such facts for the purpose of growing up to become an Individuality. Which means that a man, when he is an Individuality, has a full - grown Consciousness and a Conscience and a Will. That is the aim, and that is the description, you might say of a man, harmonious in accordance with the terminology of Gurdjieff.

So the "I" has only a temporary function. If a man could be considered full grown, meaning by that that he has three fullgrown bodies, there is no more reason for the "I" to exist, and the last act on the part of "I" is to help in the fusion of the three bodies to become one. Don't emphasize "I" too much ~~than~~ as only as a wonderful guide and a great help, but after it has fulfilled its purpose it can go back to God. Let me explain a little bit. "I" means I wish to create something that is going to help me, because in my ordinary subjectivity I don't know which way to turn because one thing is as good as another; any kind of an interpretation can be followed by any other kind of interpretation. As long as I am influenced by liking and disliking on the part of my feeling, I will never be free from myself. So the "I" is created to the extent that is my wish what I can create is, I hope, a certain kind of a form with which I am more or less familiar as a form, like the creation of an artist when he makes something that is so - called 'artistic'; he creates a form, then he hopes it will have life, he pours into it his life, sometimes quite subjective -- there is very little Objective art -- but in this case when we wishes, when one wishes to have an "I" for helping one to become Objective, one prays to God that he will send life in to this form. So "I" is made up of two things; one comes from me to the highest extent of the possibilities of my wish for wanting to understand my own life, the other is in prayer towards God

hoping that he will consider me his child.

When this "I" then starts to function, it has that kind of a task for me because it was created for me by me by the grace of God. You understand that I hope.

Terry: Yes. You really answered my question.

MR. NYLAND: The facts count. Those are the facts that one uses for the building of a Kesdjanian body. Those are the facts that are used for the building of a Soul. "I" is only instrumental to create them, and then afterwards, I have to do some more Work to see what can be used. The facts that I received of an Objective kind are like bricks. I have to build a house for the Kesdjanian body itself. Afterwards, if I know how to build a Soul, I will have to do that also in order to have a chance that if God ever comes down to Earth with me, to me, that He has a house to be in. The Soul becomes a representation of God within a man when this man grows up towards, reaching towards God wishing to be fused.

Question: Mr. Nyland?

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Question: Could you speak more about the nature of these facts? I'm unclear about just what an objective fact...

MR. NYLAND: The facts are very simple. It is the behavior of a man in the way he is in his daily life. He is made up of three different parts as we say, 'centers', and the physical and the emotional -- let's call it emotional -- and his intellectual center, all three are active as a result of life existing in any one of the three organs. The word 'center' is not very good because the physical body is not a center, it's a totality of the body. The center as far as the mind is concerned perhaps could be explained that the mind functions in the cranium, in the head in a certain place and doesn't go out of it. The word 'center' for the emotions or for the feelings is quite wrong, because there is only a little bit of a center in the form of a solar plexus. What one wishes and the

rest is divided and distributed over the totality of the body in nerve nodes and for that reason in us, as unconscious human beings, feeling and physical body are so closely connected that you cannot separate them, not easily.

But aside from the word that is being used as a 'center', I want to find out what are facts about myself which are Impartial and are obtained Simultaneously. So, I wish this "I" to Observe me, so that then there is a sense of Awareness of my existence. Now the requirement is that this Observation process becomes Objective in the sense of Impartiality and in the sense of non - associative. If I want to Observe my feeling, I would want to Observe, then, that what is partial, because that is where my likes and dislikes come from, and the "I" when, particularly when it is small, will have a hell of a time actually getting facts that are Impartial. If the requirement for the "I" is also to function Simultaneously, it has to be free from associations. It has to be free from thoughts of the future and anticipation or thoughts about the past and memory. It has to take place at the present; that is, that particular moment when the future goes over into the past. So if I start with trying to have this "I" Observe my brain, I'm already on the wrong road because I cannot be non-associatiative when I want to Observe something that is completely associative. It is difficult. In time it has to be possible. In time this "I" has to be fullgrown enough to be able to Observe emotions and feelings Impartially. It also has to be fullgrown enough ultimately to be able to see in this sense -- that is to become Aware -- of thought forms or thought processes or the activity of the mind. But in order to help this "I" to grow up, I choose first the simplest ways by which it can start to function with which there might be sufficient success. I use simply then for that reason the physical body, without indicating that that is all there is to it because I definitely have to become Observant, that is Aware of that what

takes place in my solar plexus or maybe ultimately my heart and definitely I have to know about my thought processes. But this little "I" has to learn to grow up. Is that it?

(Side Two)

(That window can be opened a little. You open the door.)

So knowing that the little "I" is very small when it starts, even if my wish is that it ought to be greater my capacity is impossible to make an "I" already full-grown, it cannot be done. So if "I", this "I", has to grow up, I will give it as easy a task, and I take the physical appearance of my body about which it can become Aware simply because in the movements of my physical body as one little manifestation there is sometimes very little reason to assume that I have to like it and it is also possible that I don't have associations with it. Many times when I look at habits, that is habitual forms of behavior physically, I can bring it back to a certain statement so that then there is a little bit of a mental quality of a description, but no more than that because after all --- [What is it? Is it too hot? (response by someone)] If there is a habit the mind is not functioning. If I bring it back to my mind I have no difficulty about the mind itself affecting this effort of observing that what is taking place which is now, you might say, first noticeable and then I become, this "I" becomes aware of it. So in that way I consider the activities of the physical body first, and I become acquainted with the behavior forms of my physical body, all the time using that what is the form of behavior for an existence of "I" of which then I myself, even could become aware. But the main portion is that this "I" is functioning in relation to me and gives me facts about my existence. Now this existence in the beginning is only the physical body, and later on it will be the existence of the activities of life in my feeling center, after that it will be the existence of that what takes place in my mind.

Now, it may take some time before I really can be sufficiently

aware in the real sense of the manifestations of my body, but assuming now that that is a little bit further on the way, the physical body many times manifests because I have a feeling and because I have a thought. And so, sometimes it's possible to look at the manifestation and trace the source, why the manifestation existed. And for that reason I can already approach a certain Impartiality regarding my feeling and a certain non-associative value regarding the function of my mind. And that is how I gradually start to observe the other organs which are much too difficult if I want to try it in the beginning.

To make it even simpler, we many times divide the possibilities of behavior forms of the physical body in five different categories; that is, a movement and a facial expression, and a gesture, and a posture, and a tone of the voice. But those are all, all little, let's say 'pons asinorum (latin) ~~pense (french)~~', they just remind me, are a little alarm clocks. The whole point is when it <u>does</u> happen and that alarm clock goes off, I'm reminded that I must Work. So they don't substitute for Work, they only remind me, I must Work, and by Work I mean, that what is necessary for an Awareness which requires first the creation of an "I" <u>being</u> there and functioning. I don't want to go too much in detail about different ways of how to approach Work. I only stick now to what we call 'A B C'. That is a so-called intellectual approach; there is an emotional one and there is also a physical one, but it is not necessary to talk about that now. Does it answer you?

<u>Questioner:</u> Yes Sir.

<u>MR. NYLAND:</u> It would be nice if you asked questions really, because that brings much more life into a group because otherwise you would just sit. You go home, maybe you wanted, would have wanted to ask a question and you don't do it. We will have another meeting a week from today I hope. You can come then but if you don't ask questions there is no sense for me to come here.

<u>Rita Stochosky:</u> Mr. Nyland, would you explain what Gurdjieff meant by

Obective art?

MR. NYLAND: Ah! Why should I? I can say in a very general way, Objective art is a form of art which effects everybody alive. It does not mean that it is liked or disliked, it has an effect on a person and sets in every person certain things in motion, sometimes emotionally, sometimes ordinary feeling. That is real Objective art. There are very few examples in the world. The seven wonders of the world, as you probably remember, they are Objective forms of art. Some times we say Mt. St. Michelle, sometimes the cathedral in Rheims, sometimes Lourdes, sometimes the Taj Mahal, that's a little bit questionable, there are also different interpretations about that but the question of Objectivity and art is very very difficult to define, simply because we don't know what Objectivity is.

Rita Stochasky: O. K.

Susan Inadoni: Mr. Nyland?

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Susan Inadoni: I feel like my mind, my mind seems like it's becoming numb. I don't, its very difficult for me to read right now.

MR. NYLAND: Read what?

Susan Inadoni: Read ALL & EVERYTHING

MR. NYLAND: Why?

Susan Inadoni: I don't know.

MR. NYLAND: How often have you read it?

Susan Inadoni: I have read it twice.

MR. NYLAND: Too bad, isn't it? You have to read it for the third time. (laughter) Yeah. Those are the instructions, aren't they? Can you wait a little bit. Maybe at certain time you leaf through the book a little, and you are mindful or you're struck again by something that you did read before. Read it however if possible for the third time in a regular sequence from the beginning to the end. Don't skip! It's very, very bad. You have to read it three times, from page one to the end, and the second

time as if aloud to someone else, you do read it aloud as if someone else is there. It's for a very special reason. Gurdjieff was no fool. And the third reading is that you understand for yourself that he is talking about you. That you appear on each page, and that it's worthwhile to find out what actually is you yourself by trying to read it for the third time. So if that is really the aim, you only should do it when you actually wish to find out more about yourself. And if you, at the present time, are a little bit maybe tired of it, or not enough desire, I would simply suggest, don't do it. As I say, leaf through it, perhaps something will remind you and then you can read from the beginning three pages, close the book, Two or three weeks later read ten pages, close the book. Don't force it. Whenever you wish to read All And Everything you have to be really in that kind of a state that you want to find out something about yourself. The book is worthwhile because it is a scripture, it is not just an ordinary book. By scripture I mean that that what you are reading now and you read it for the tenth time still will have something else in it that you haven't seen before. I wouldn't worry too much about it. It will come if you keep in mind that perhaps you ought to do it. Ten thousand years later maybe you'll do it. All right? Yeah don't worry.

Questioner: Mr. Nyland.

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Questioner: In the discussion group last week we were dealing with the statement, ah, if a man is not first, he is last and ~~he~~, you better start counting your chickens, and, ah, I came from this discussion with no understanding at all of what this meant and, ah,...

MR. NYLAND: Why, you don't have chickens?

Questioner: I was wondering about this statement itself and how it would be applied in terms of Gurdjieffian philosophy.

MR. NYLAND: Are you taking it a little bit out of context?

Questioner: Ah, I don't really understand it. I've tried to like grapple

with it from various points of view and see it on different levels, but, ah, you know I really don't have the vaguest idea what it means and that's you know that's what's disturbing me.

MR. NYLAND: What would it mean if a man is not first but last?

Questioner: I don't think that those are the only two choices that are open to man.

MR. NYLAND: Oh. What do you think is more open?

Questioner: Ah. Well I wouldn't say more open but I would say that between first and last there is an infinite number of spaces and I don't think you have to be either first or last, there's all that other space that...

MR. NYLAND: Yeh. But what would be meant, what would be meant by it? Man is what he is at the present time. You might say first or last; it doesn't matter as long as you know that he exists. Then if you want to define where he is, what particular place would you assign to him? To yourself, where are you regarding and the potentialities of yourself or the actuality: what you are? It all depends what your definition would be for a man. If you consider a man unconscious and a nincompoop and he doesn't know very much what to do, I definitely think he is at a very low level. Not necessarily critical in any sense, and it surely can be accepted because all of us are unconscious. We're asleep and we know that, at times. If, on the other hand, a man is actually so that he does know what he is doing and is Awake and is then in that sense Self-Conscious, he's quite a different kind of a man. Now, where you want to place a man who's going from this one state into another one, of course there is all kind of possibilities that he is ten percent one and ninety the other, and if he continues to live and perhaps even Works on himself, maybe that changes into ninety percent Consciousness and ten percent unconscious. So of course there are all kinds of gradations. The question is what is man now before he has heard anything about Objectivity. Before he has had any knowledge, any idea of esoteric

knowledge. Before he knows anything about the possibilities of spiritual unfoldment. Before he actually realizes that there is something essential and something superficial in him, or that he assumes that that what is his feeling is already in the right place or that he assumes that his mind is so marvelous that there is no further possibility of further development any more. As long as he doesn't think about such questions, if you want to consider a man as man number one, two and three like Ouspensky sometimes calls it, there is a great deal of difference between such a man and man so-called number four. So the man number one, two, and three who is totally unconscious and very nice in ordinary life, he is very low in the level of being. You understand now a little bit where man belongs?

Questioner: Uh, I'm not sure that I understand---

MR. NYLAND: Are you unconscious or Conscious?

Questioner: Ah, I'm, I'm sometimes each.

MR. NYLAND: How much are you one or the other? One percent

Questioner: I try to be as conscious, you know, as possible.

MR. NYLAND: Now wait a minute! In our sense of the word, now, Conscious. Consciousness is a very sharp definition, what is Consciousness in accordance with our terms. It means it has to include the acceptance of myself as I am, Now! That means Impartiality and Simultaneity. That is the only definition of Consciousness. Not just using your brains a little bit. This is what I mean. What do you know about Work? Because this statement was made regarding a man who was not working, or, a man who did Work. That's why you don't understand it.

Questioner: Well, judging by that definition of consciousness I would say that at this point I was conscious for sometime.

MR. NYLAND: No. Nonsense. Excuse me. You're not Conscious. You think you're Conscious now?

Questioner: At this moment?

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Questioner: I'm trying very hard to be.

MR. NYLAND: Yeah. Are you Impartial to yourself? Of course not. You're terribly bound up with yourself, right now.

Questioner: I'm trying to deal with ----

MR. NYLAND: Yeh. You're trying to deal with it.

Questioner: -----various conflicts.

MR. NYLAND: Huh?

Questioner: which, you know, I have been experiencing-----

MR. NYLAND: No. No. Of course you think about yourself all the time, what kind of an impression you make. Of course you're concerned with yourself, you're not free. And Consciousness is just one, one-third you might say. Conscience is still quite a different thing. Will we leave it at that?

Questioner: I think so.

MR. NYLAND: Yeah. Think about it a little bit, if you will.

Questioner: Mr. Nyland.

MR. NYLAND: Yeah. Two at a time! (laughter) We're getting along. Yeah. Who's first?

Questioner: Ah. Could you kind of comment on...I had this,, ah, well, this is a kind of thing over the years; it goes, uh; 'observers of life should not be involved'.

MR. NYLAND: Well, do you understand that?

Questioner: Um. Well, orginally I thought it meant to kind of, um, withdraw from life.....

MR. NYLAND: No.

Questioner: ...in order to observe it.

MR. NYLAND: No, it doesn't.

Questioner: Yeah. Well, now in this context of the Work I've come to realize....

MR. NYLAND: Involvement is an emotional quality, isn't it.

Questioner: Excuse me?

MR. NYLAND: Involvement is becoming emotional, identified.

Questioner: Yeah.

MR. NYLAND: So, Observation, true Observation should be without identification. It is exactly the same as what we are saying; it should be Impartial.

Questioner: But I don't see how you can be not involved and still be in the middle of it.

MR. NYLAND: Because you don't have the experience of what it might be if one actually tries to become Conscious. You try it. You try it when you walk and see if something, as it were, like, like "I" could be present to you who records you, your existence. If you sit in a chair and close your eyes, is there something that can become Aware of your sitting as a body, without any particular thought at all, just an Awareness of your existence? You have to try it because otherwise you never will find out. But that's, those are the first steps of the beginning of Work. So it doesn't mean that you haven't had the experience. You have never done anything in order to have the experience, and maybe you can have the experience. If that's the case, you will know what we are talking about. Have you read much?

Questioner: Uhm---I've read about ten chapters of the Search and I've just started reading, ah, Tales to my grandson. I read Remarkable Men, Meetings with Remarkable Men.

MR. NYLAND: Yeah. That is, that's more or less a general book. All And Everything is the book really; it's the Bible. Have you read any of it?

Questioner: Ah, I've read three pages of that book.

MR. NYLAND: Not much, is it huh? When you think that there are a thousand pages.

Questioner: I read the entire table of contents. (laughter)

MR. NYLAND: That's already more than many of us have. Who has ever heard of the book, or, who never heard of it, let alone reading the chapters of the contents. Could we say it this way: if you want to come back next time you ought to have at least a little bit knowledge of All And Everything otherwise don't come? You see, I'm talking about Gurdjieff. I'm not talking about anyone else. I'm not talking about pupils of him, good as they may have been at certain times. I'm particularly interested in it for the simple reason that Gurdjieff gives you information of how to Work, and therefore I am the only, the only judge of myself. If I can verify my experience that Gurdjieff is right in what he is saying, I will believe in him. But I cannot go by the interpretation of someone else. It's my life that is at stake when I wish to Work. That is why Gurdjieff is really quite remarkable, because he tells me what to do, and no maybe about it. And that's why I say we talk about Gurdjieff; not Nicoll, not anyone else. Good as they are, deHartmann and Ouspensky and so forth, fine, but Gurdjieff is it. So, will we stop?

Question: Mr. Nyland, I have another question. Um, it has to do with something that Steve was talking about. Uh, in such quotes as, uh, passages of, uh...

MR. NYLAND: I don't hear you. Say it again.

Question: In such passages as, uh, if a man is not first he is last! um, does that mean man in general or does that mean man as different than woman.

MR. NYLAND: Don't you think I said enough about it? Keep on thinking a little bit for yourself to see if you can come to a conclusion. If you still don't know next week you can ask the same question. I said enough. Sometimes things are just given with a little indication of the direction in which you have to think. It's not going to be given on any kind of a golden platter. Work means Work. That is, you have to make an attempt and an effort. You have to do something, and

in this particular case you have to think about what we have been talking about to see if you then can understand it. If you don't make such attempts, it is of no use. The only time that you will have an experience is by the application of what you have heard. Even meditation has a very definite reason for existence provided it keeps going in a certain momentum and is not distracted by a variety of other little thoughts. Work on yourself makes a very, means a very definite attempt because it is not easy to beat death. And that's what you're doing if you want to Work. So, let's leave it, if you want to, until next week.

Who of the Group, Al, is here who has been meeting before? I've listened to your variety of tapes. You know, you've had four or five meetings so far, and there were certain questions. I do not know if the answers were given, really, or satisfactorily. Is any one of those still here? Al?

Al Finn: People are here.

MR. NYLAND: Eh?

Al Finn: They're here.

MR. NYLAND: Why aren't they talking? Harry, Harry, what will we do?

Question: Mr. Nyland?

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Question: Um. Would you explain more, um, the way...well, the way you work with people and things?

MR. NYLAND: How do you mean, work with people.

Question: Well----

MR. NYLAND: We talk about Work and the people Work. I don't

Question: Yea. Well. O. K. Well, people kind of formed groups and, um, read certain works of Gurdjieff's.

MR. NYLAND: We talk about Work. We have a group. Each person has some question because he has Worked. Whenever a person Works he has to have questions, because it is difficult, it is new territory, it is

like a new adventure. He has to say what actually he has found out. He wants to make sure that he is on the right road. Whatever the question may be will lead to perhaps a certain discussion, sometimes some other people who also have tried to Work have an idea about what he is saying and then they add their little bit to the total value of information which is then going around the group as a whole. If I'm there I stop it sometimes, and sometimes I add a little bit, and that is the way we work together. There's no particular rule for it, it's just a matter of getting together when one is interested in Work on oneself. Then of course if one is, there are always questions. That's why I'm amazed that we have no questions, practically.

Question: Mr. Nyland?

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Question: What would you define as man's responsibility to his fellow man.

MR. NYLAND: The possibilities of what?

Question: The responsibilities of man to his fellow man. Work is...

MR. NYLAND: No, what. The second line of Work, huh? Is that what you meant?

Question: I have a specific, um, I have the ability of observing I in myself, and can I presume to act as an observer for #, someone sitting next to me if I am not feeling impartially myself?

MR. NYLAND: Oh, no. It's none of your business. No. If it is asked by the other person that perhaps you might have an answer, of course you can answer. You have absolutely no right to criticize anyone else. You attend...huh?

Question: What do you define as criticism.

MR. NYLAND: Criticism? Oh. That someone is not Working, for instance. Or that you question the veracity of what he is saying. I hope I understood you well enough. There is of course an exchange between people when one or the other is Working, then they can converse in a kind of a language that becomes understandable to both of them because they will

use terms that have to do with Work as an experience. In such a case when one gets together in a group wanting to talk about Work, it is necessary to talk about work sensibly and clearly, and of course if one cannot do that so easily he may be helped by someone else. But in general I think when he has Worked enough he will know what to talk about. Does that apply?

Question: Yes, it does. I know from my own experience that I don't often ask for someone to observe for me, but I am asking and from my own experience I feel sometimes that is necessary to, um, to do the observing with someone else even though they are not out front asking. If they are sitting in a place such as a room as this where they are supposedly interested in the Work, I would assume that each of us is developing an observing I....

MR. NYLAND: Oh. You think so, that, in a group like this?

Question: that is one of the aims.

MR. NYLAND: Yeh. I think one percent, perhaps have thought about Work while we're sitting here. In my terminology there is very little of Work at the present time present. There is very little aliveness regarding the wish to grow up in the sense Gurdjieff means it. So, I have no particular reason to assume that anyone is Working. If they do Work, it should flow over. It should be really be, as Orage used to call it, 'hot, hot under the collar'. There should be abundance of aliveness regarding Work. There should be a desire for adventure and the continuation of finding out what is new, how to uncover that what is the development of one's spiritual life. When one really is serious about one's life, you're going to do something about it, because if you don't Gurdjieff would say 'you die like a dog', and people don't want to believe that, they think they'll die like a human being and a human being is nothing else but an ordinary animal when he is unconscious because he has just a little brain which disappears when he dies.

We're talking about the manufacture of a Soul, of something that has a chance even perhaps to see God or to be recognized by God. We talk about God many times. There's a question about the depth of one's life; the question of the realization that one has to do something in this life otherwise you have to do it again and again; the question of a Karma which has to be eaten, has to be understood, has to be followed up. Such are the laws in the universe. And there is no mocking about that; there is no fun, there is no humoring God. Work is a religion because it is a conduct of life. Gurdjieff has a whole chapter on religion. It plays a definite part because it is an emotional quality that has to be engaged. If there is no emotion you will never wish to Work. Your intellect won't tell you to Work. At most, your intellect can tell you a little but how A B C is put together and what is required. The intellect is a little bit of the light on the path, but it doesn't mean you're walking. The wish to walk comes from something that is much deeper; that is your emotional state. Your mind is not capable of it as yet because it is far, far from being a mind, a real mind. An intellect as a Soul doesn't exist. All we do is a little association, a couple of words and be clever and have some formulations here and there. Every once in a while we think about pondering and we have a nice big word like the thalamus and the hypothalamus and so forth of an emotional quality, and weighing thoughts and sentences, selecting of the right word, even we write poetry. It's not that I sneeze at such things, but don't think it is Objectivity and don't think it reaches God at all. God is not interested in that kind of thing.

So, what will we do. I said before I'm not going to give a lecture. If you're interested there are thousands of them. You can listen to any kind of a tape if you like.

Question: Mr. Nyland?

MR. NYLAND: Yeah.

Question: Um, what does it mean to....

MR. NYLAND: Hum. I can't hear you.

Question: What does it mean to become more simple. How can I become more simple.

MR. NYLAND: Bread and water. No wall - to - wall carpets. Simple in your language. Simple in your feeling. Not desiring too much for your body. No particular interest in gossip. Not just blah, blah, blah and talk, talk, talk. Just mind your own business. Very little entry into the affairs of others unless they ask you. Consideration of others to see what is right for them in order to help them to grow up. Judging constantly what is right for a man to be able to live in Consciousness and Conscience. What to do to help someone who needs that kind of help, actually to give him that what belongs to you at the present time because it is your experience. When they ask for bread don't give them a stone. That is simplicity. It's very simple.

Question: Mr. Nyland?

MR. NYLAND: Yeh.

Question: Um. I've read a little bit about knowledge and Being. Would knowledge be like what you're talking about, your intellect, and Being be more of your emotions and feelings?

MR. NYLAND: No. I think that Being is made up of the combination of the three centers. I think that the knowledge changes into understanding when it is applied and has become an experience. In that particular process all three centers have to become engaged, because I cannot Observe my body without having the wish to do it. And so, when there is a combination of the three centers, and to some extent they are unified in a certain aim, that raises the level of my Being. A Being is something that exists as a unit in which the different differences between centers have been erased, or at least have been fused sufficiently together. It is practically impossible for an ordinary unconscious man; it is definitely possible for a man who is Conscious and Conscientious and, according to Gurdjieff, even has a Will. But that

means he is on a higher kind of a level already. A level of Being. And in that process, when the three full-grown bodies have actually grown up to the point of Si-Do for each one of them, and the man is still alive on earth, he will have a chance to fuse into a oneness, and this entity as one is the entry into Cosmic Consciousness. Try to see what is the difference between knowledge and understanding. Then you will understand what is the level of Being. Logically, from the level of Being, any one of the three centers can receive information of how to act.

If you want an illustration of that, any kind of a chemical element that is made up out of different components is at a certain time, depending on circumstances -- conditions-volume, temperature, pressure and so forth -- able to split up into the component parts. At the same time also, given such conditions in the reverse, the components can make an entity, let's say as an element or a certain chemical substance. Whenever that takes place, the chemical substance which is the end-product has different properties from any of the component parts. And so it is with the three centers. When they are combined into one, the level of Being has no more resemblance to any activity on the part of the centers themselves. But at any one time, given good conditions which are conducive for that kind of splitting up, the Being can be represented by any one of the activities of the three centers. Does that help any?

Question: Yeh (unintelligible)

MR. NYLAND: Well, a little more light in the intellect. Are you satisfied with tonight? Not much, huh? If you want to talk again about Gurdjieff, come back next week. If you don't want to, it won't make me mad.

Good Night.